



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : **10/665,889**
5 Filing Date : **19 SEPT 2003**
First Named Inventor : **DANIEL J. GREGOIRE**
10 Firm Docket No. : **HRL025-DIV**
Art unit : **1763**
Examiner : **BUEKER, RICHARD R.**
15 Office Action Mailing Date : **06 DECEMBER 2006**
Response Date : **07 MAY 2007**

TITLE: APPARATUS FOR LARGE SCALE DIAMOND POLISHING

20
United States Patent and Trademark Office
ATTN: Richard R. Bueker
BOX RESPONSES
Washington, D.C. 20231

25
Dear Examiner:
This communication is responsive to the Final Office Action dated 06 DECEMBER
2006, having a statutory response period with extensions, extending through and
including May 07, 2007. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the
30 following Amendments and consider the Remarks made below to the above captioned
application. No new subject matter has been added, and **all amendments and remarks**
herein are made without prejudice.

Interview Summary begin on page 2 of this communication.
35 Listing of Claims begin on page 3 of this communication.
Remarks/Arguments begin on page 8 of this communication.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

5 Date: April 5, 2007
Time: 1:30 PM (PST)
Parties present: Richard R. Bueker (PTO Examiner), Marcus Risso (patent attorney with Tope-McKay & Associates), and Sylvia Dominguez (patent engineer with Tope-McKay & Associates).

10 Claims discussed: Claim 1, Claim 7, Claim 15, and Claim 16
Subject Matter: The rejection by the Examiner of the use of a “container” in Claims 15 and 16.

A telephonic interview was held with the Examiner on April 5, 2007. During the
15 interview, the Examiner stated that the specification for U.S. Patent Application No. 10/665,889 did not support the use of the word “container,” as claimed in Claims 15 and 16. However, the Examiner agreed that the language in the specification (referring to page 8 lines 18 to 20) supports the use of the phrases: “means for positioning;” a “positioning device;” or a “positioning apparatus.” The Examiner further stated that
20 “using a positioning device is an acceptable meaning of the disclosure,” and that the Examiner will be willing to remove his rejection of Claims 2-6 and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, if the Applicants amend the claims to remove the word “container” and replace it with a “positioning device.”